

Appl. No. 09/744,874
Amdt. dated June 7, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 8, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, and the rejection of claims 1-11 are respectfully requested. Applicants have attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated December 8, 2003 (Paper No. 17) and believe the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (5,598,892) in view of Causey *et al.* (4,207,675). Fox requires a large, linearly moveable “U”-shaped member 70 to activate the trigger on a hand tool using a relatively cumbersome arrangement which appears predisposed to suffer from frictional binding, given the size of the “U”-shaped member 70 and the requirement that it slidably engage the bracket 66. Causey is merely cited for disclosing a slidable supplemental handle. Causey focuses on electronic rather than mechanical control over the tool.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a trigger lever operatively connected to the trigger, and wherein the trigger activator controls the trigger lever to operate the trigger associated with the hand tool. This amendment is supported in the present application at least at the paragraphs beginning on pg. 4, ln. 16, pg. 7, ln. 5-10, and FIG. 3.

Appl. No. 09/744,874
Amdt. dated June 7, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 8, 2003

Utilizing a trigger lever 50 over the various mechanisms employed by the cited prior art inventions provide the advantages of a simple construction, requiring minimal moving parts and material to activate the trigger. Even if Fox were combined with Causey, the invention as now recited would neither be disclosed nor suggested. Accordingly, the rejection based on a combination of Fox and Causey is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (5,598,892) in view of Causey *et al.* (4,207,675) in further view of Swiderski Jr. *et al.* (4,147,220). The arguments asserted above traversing the rejection based on Fox and Causey are reasserted here. Swiderski teaches the use of a lanyard rather than the trigger lever of the present invention.

In contrast, as amended, claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 7 and recite, *inter alia*, one end of a cable is connected to the handle lever such that pivoting of the handle lever causes the relative length of the cable to increase or decrease to control activation of the trigger associated with the hand tool, and the cable is attached at its opposite end to the trigger lever which is pivoted via the relative shortening or lengthening of the cable, to control activation of the trigger associated with the hand tool. Utilizing the trigger lever 50 over the various mechanisms employed by the cited prior art inventions provides an operator with the advantages of a better and more realistic feel by more accurately imitating the actual

Appl. No. 09/744,874
Amdt. dated June 7, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 8, 2003

squeeze feel of a person's finger on the trigger of the hand tool itself. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references disclose the dual lever system with the pivoted trigger lever as recited in amended claim 11.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10 and 11 ultimately depend from claim 1, as amended submitted to be allowable over the Fox reference. None of these references, Fox, Causey, or Swiderski, taken either alone or in combination, disclose the invention as now recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 11 are also submitted to be allowable and the rejection based on Fox, Causey, and Swiderski is respectfully traversed.


Applicants submit that, in view of the above-identified amendments and remarks, the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

June 7, 2004
300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel.: (312) 360-0080
Fax: (312) 360-9315
Customer No.: 24978

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Lawrence J. Crain
Reg. No. 31,497

Attorney for Applicants

K:\1029\65160\65160AmdC.doc